

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

My understanding is that, in order to broadcast this slander, Sinclair is labeling the film as "news," and therefore claims that its stations have no obligation to present differing viewpoints. How does a film produced many months ago qualify as news? This is a clear case of the company's use of its monopoly power to sway a presidential election. I cannot believe that Sinclair is not violating the terms of its stations' licenses.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.